

6-7-1963

1963 - Board of Trustee Meeting Minutes

Board of Trustees, Central Washington University

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/bot_minutes

Recommended Citation

Board of Trustees, Central Washington University, "1963 - Board of Trustee Meeting Minutes" (1963). *CWU Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes*. Book 124.

http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/bot_minutes/124

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the University Archives and Special Collections at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in CWU Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU.

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

Minutes of the Board of Trustees Meeting

Victor J. Bouillon Library
Central Washington
State College
Ellensburg, Washington

Conference Center
Central Washington State College
June 7, 1963

The regular meeting of the Board of Trustees was held on June 7, 1963 in the Conference Center on the campus of Central Washington State College. Board members present were: Mr. Victor J. Bouillon, Chairman; Dr. Roy P. Wahle, Vice Chairman; Mrs. Frank Therriault; and Dr. Archie S. Wilson. Absent was Mrs. Frederick W. Davis.

Also present were Dr. James E. Brooks, President; Dr. J. Wesley Crum; Mr. Kenneth Courson; Dr. Alexander Howard; Dr. Maurice Pettit; Mrs. Norman Howell; Miss Helen Michaelsen, Dr. Robert Yee; Mr. Wilhelm Bakke; Miss Grace Armstrong; Mr. Frank Allen; Mr. Harold Overland; Mr. Milo Smith; Dr. Loretta Miller; Mrs. Archie Wilson; Mrs. Roy Wahle; Dr. Roy Ruebel; Dr. William Floyd; Dr. William Hooper; Mr. James Farrell; Dr. Daryl Basler; Mr. Kenneth Berry; Mrs. Mary Elizabeth Whitner; Dr. Donald Warner; Mr. Walter Prigge; Dr. Chester Keller; Dr. Ernest Muzzall; Mr. Roy Wilson; Dr. Clifford Erickson; Mr. Ed Erickson; Miss Janet Lowe; Mr. Lloyd Buckles; Dr. Ralph Gustafson; Miss Dorothy Dean; Mr. Charles Wright; Miss Barbara Kohler; Dr. Dan Willson; Dr. Louis Kollmeyer; Dr. Eldon Jacobsen; Miss Amanda Hebel; Mr. Bruce Robinson; Dr. Donald Baepfer; Dr. Gerald Gage; Mr. Gerald Halsey; Mr. Finis Johnson; Mr. Henry Crowley, and Mrs. James Brooks. Mrs. Owen Paul, secretary to the President, acted as secretary.

Mr. Victor J. Bouillon, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 8 p. m.

MOTION NO. 423: Dr. Wahle moved, seconded by Dr. Wilson, that Mrs. Frederick W. Davis be excused from attending the meeting. Motion carried.

Dr. Brooks asked that the following items be added to the expanded agenda: Under Reports, Item G - Budget Report for the Period Ending April 30, 1963; and Item H - Refunding of Admission Processing Fee. Under New Business, Item H - S.G.A. Budget.

MOTION NO. 424: Mrs. Therriault moved, seconded by Dr. Wilson that Items G and H under Reports and Item H under New Business be added to the expanded agenda. Motion carried.

MOTION NO. 425: Dr. Wilson moved that Item A under Unfinished Business (selection of architect for administration building) be placed as the last item of business on the agenda. Motion was seconded by Mrs. Therriault. Motion carried.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION NO. 426: Mrs. Therriault moved, seconded by Dr. Wahle that the minutes for the meeting of May 24, 1963 be approved. Motion carried.

Dr. Brooks explained that the 1963-64 faculty salary scale had not been determined at the time that salaries were approved for the Sabbatical leaves granted during 1963-64 (March 2, 1963 minutes) and that administrative salaries had not been reviewed when Mr. John Ludtka's salary for 1963-64 was determined (April 27, 1963 minutes). Now that the salary scales have been established it is desirable to make some adjustments in the Sabbatical leave salaries and Mr. Ludtka's salary in order to bring them up to scale.

MOTION NO. 427: Dr. Wahle moved, seconded by Dr. Wilson, that the Sabbatical leaves salaries and Mr. John Ludtka's salary for 1963-64 be corrected as indicated so that they will reflect the change occasioned by the adoption of a new salary scale. Motion carried.

REPORTS OF PRESIDENT AND ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS

Mrs. Mary Elizabeth Whitner was asked to join the Board at this time in order that a discussion which Mrs. Whitner has requested might take place.

Mr. Bouillon summarized what has gone on in connection with this matter. On November 6, 1962, Mrs. Whitner sent a letter to the Board of Trustees containing a question. The letter was considered in an executive session and a reply was sent to Mrs. Whitner by Mr. Bouillon on November 26, 1962. On January 8, 1963 in a letter to Mr. Bouillon Mrs. Whitner questioned the board's procedure in handling her letter in executive session. The Board made Mrs. Whitner's letters public by reviewing the letters and the situation in an open board meeting on January 28, 1963. Subsequently on February 11, 1963, Mrs. Whitner was informed by the President of the college of the board action. Still later on March 26, 1963, Mrs. Whitner wrote to all college personnel informing them she had not received an answer from the Board to her letter of November 6 and including a statement on academic freedom which statement she had prepared for a faculty meeting on December 10, 1962. After reading aloud the question contained in Mrs. Whitner's letter of November 6, 1962, which is as follows: "If, as a faculty member, I find myself having to choose between loyalty to the academic community or to academic discipline and loyalty to the Constitution of the United States, what, in your opinion, should be my position?" Mr. Bouillon stated that the Board of Trustees has at all times assumed that the laws of the State of Washington and the Constitution of the United States must be upheld. Mr. Bouillon further stated that all faculty members and the members of the Board have sworn to do this. Mr. Bouillon informed Mrs. Whitner it was her duty to report specific examples where she is forced to do otherwise and that he would ask her later for specific examples where state laws and/or the United States Constitution have been or are being violated by Central Washington State College. Mr. Bouillon continued by saying that Mrs. Whitner had been protected in her letter writing the last two years and that this will continue but that Mrs. Whitner must realize the implications of her actions. Mr. Bouillon said because professional resources (duplicating services, stationery, etc.) which are a part of CWSC are available to Mrs. Whitner it is assumed by the public (not stated as being so by the Board) that these are being used by her. Mrs. Whitner's duplicated letters are sent individually with no indication of their distribution, Mr. Bouillon stated. Mr. Bouillon continued to say that Mrs. Whitner's two roles of faculty member and private citizen are misunderstood by the public and by the college employees. Mrs. Whitner's activities are a concern of the Board and the

President of the institution and Mr. Bouillon expressed this concern to Mrs. Whitner. Mr. Bouillon pointed out that the implications the public draws are a reflection on the college and its personnel and that public relations and the effectiveness of the board and president in working with those who support the college can be damaged by the implications. Mr. Bouillon also advised Mrs. Whitner that some say she has not always shown a responsibility to her colleagues by not expressing her concerns to them first. Mr. Bouillon then asked Mrs. Whitner again if she could cite any specific examples to the effect that CWSC is not following the state laws and the laws established by the United States Constitution.

Mrs. Whitner asked if rather than answer Mr. Bouillon's question right away she might be allowed to give some background information. She was informed she could do this with the provision that the information should be pertinent. Mrs. Whitner then proceeded to say that this was the end of her 4th year at Central and that her first two years were spent very quietly and happily in the Music Department. She commented that she was grateful for the opportunity to teach students. She said she first became uneasy at the end of her 2nd year when the AAUP began to make inquiries about the various division heads and she realized the effect it could have on her. The first time she took any action was in answering a letter that appeared in the Campus Crier following an appearance on campus by Col. Leon Volkov. She said she realized that what was being said about Col. Volkov could have a direct bearing on her. The implication was that because he was not an educator he could not speak about education and because he was not a political scientist he could not speak about things political and therefore he must be just an entertainer. The implication to Mrs. Whitner was that as a music educator she might not be allowed to speak on matters concerning every citizen.

The next time Mrs. Whitner was concerned, she said, was when Gus Hall was scheduled to appear on campus. She said at first when she knew Gus Hall was coming she did not give it much thought but subsequently his visit was cancelled and she was called by several people who asked for her reactions. Her answer was that she had not been informed that Gus Hall was being considered for an appearance on the campus and she felt the time to discuss a thing was before an action is taken and that as a faculty member she would have appreciated being asked for an expression before Hall was invited. She said one of the reasons given for the cancellation was the pressure from the legislature and the public. The implication was that the legislature should not be in a position to bring pressure to bear on a public institution and that the public should not bring pressure to bear on an institution which it supports. Mrs. Whitner said she did not wish to be separated from the public; she felt that if the public could not be heard, eventually she could not be heard. So she wrote a letter to the Campus Crier and to the Ellensburg Daily Record.

Mrs. Whitner said the third time she was concerned involved the matter of the Symposium. Mrs. Whitner said she had received from Dr. Brooks an inquiry on a proposal for a symposium and wrote him a letter stating her objections. Mrs. Whitner said she was then appointed to the Symposium Committee. When she went to the committee meeting she said she found all basic plans had been made and the committee was simply implementing them. Mrs. Whitner said she had from the beginning questioned the emphasis on values, which she feels are an individual matter and cannot be delegated to any particular area of the curriculum. The more the symposium continued the more strongly she felt. She wanted to point out that

at least one person on campus had some misgivings so she wrote a letter to the legislature and to the newspapers throughout the state.

Mrs. Whitner said that she realized increasingly how important the law was. She was appointed to the General Education Committee two years ago and felt unprepared by not having sufficient background for the assignment. Much time was spent in study and by the end of the year Mrs. Whitner said she was much better informed and had begun to understand that in many respects the academic community would like to be above the restrictions which restrain the ordinary citizen. Mrs. Whitner said "I do not understand a thing unless I understand what it says to me." She said she did not want to be above the law. She said she wondered where the pressures in the academic community were arising and she studied the laws concerning education, which might prove enlightening. She mentioned the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education which she said as she read it (the law establishing WICHE) seemed to show one avenue of bringing pressure on campus. She said she wrote a letter simply asking the questions which this law raised. She said she did not know what a storm it would stir up. She said she had received many letters and had a file of answers to her letters. She said she also prepared a statement on the speaker policy, which was read to the faculty and included in the minutes. She said she took a stand on the Honor's program and has questions about this, implying that the program might be a wedge to divide students and create an elite. She stated her correspondence with the Board had been reviewed by Mr. Bouillon in his introductory remarks, and she felt the question she had asked the Board was even more pertinent. She queried, "Does being a member of the academic community place me outside the law, a place where I have no desire to be?"

Mr. Bouillon reminded Mrs. Whitner that she still had not cited specific examples of where she had been forced to make a decision against the laws of the state or against the Constitution and that he would again inquire if she could cite specific examples of where state laws and the Constitution were being violated.

Mrs. Whitner replied that she thought the closest thing to it, (and she thought perhaps this could be considered a violation of the law) occurred in her own department (the Music Department) when Central students were allowed to take part in a religious service in Yakima. Mrs. Whitner stated she felt strongly enough about this to call Dr. Hertz, the department chairman, who was away at the time.

Dr. Brooks asked Mrs. Whitner if she had said this came close to it or was a violation of the law. Mrs. Whitner replied she would have to investigate the law more closely before she could say but that the law forbids any sectarian influence. She reminded him of her inquiry at the time the Ministerial Association asked to meet with the General Education Committee year before last.

Dr. Brooks stated he was just as concerned about Mrs. Whitner's activities as the Board. He said the law requires the college officials and employees to uphold state laws and the United States Constitution. He said it was his obligation to see that no laws are broken at Central. He asked Mrs. Whitner again if she was saying that this particular instance may be a violation of the law. Mrs. Whitner replied that she questioned it but could not say definitely unless she could make a further study.

Dr. Wilson asked Dr. Brooks if any college funds were used in this connection and Dr. Brooks replied not to his knowledge. Dr. Brooks said that a number of music students from Central's choir had volunteered to sing one evening in an Episcopal church in Yakima. They signed statements that they were doing it on their own. He said many religions were represented by the students going to Yakima for the performance. No college equipment was used to Dr. Brooks' knowledge, and the students were reimbursed for dinner in Yakima by the Episcopal Church in Yakima. Dr. Wilson asked if any of these activities occurred on the college campus and Dr. Brooks replied that the representative of the church in Yakima did make the first contact with the Director of the choir, Dr. Hertz. Forty students volunteered and Dr. Hertz selected about 22 to go to Yakima.

Dr. Wahle asked Mrs. Whitner if there were other times when she felt there were violations of the law. Mrs. Whitner replied that there are matters about which she has questions. She said if she were certain on them she would have moved on them. Mrs. Whitner said, "I do not want to make accusations without being ready to move."

Dr. Wahle again read Mrs. Whitner's original question and asked her if she felt she had received an answer. Mrs. Whitner replied that she had never had a specific reply. Dr. Wahle then asked Mrs. Whitner if she were on the Board in their place what answer would she give; what answer would she wish to hear. Mrs. Whitner replied that she had more doubts now than when she wrote the letter. The doubts continue to mount rather than to diminish, she said. Mrs. Whitner was again asked if she had not received a specific reply from the Board to her question.

Mrs. Whitner stated that a member of the Board had come to see her and had talked at some length. Mrs. Whitner said that although she was assured it was an unofficial visit she was also informed that it had the Board's approval. She said, "I was not given a clear answer to my question."

Dr. Wahle once again asked Mrs. Whitner what she wanted the Board to say or what she wanted to hear from the Board. "If you were in the Board's position and were asked the question what would you wish to have the Board respond?" Dr. Wahle asked. Mrs. Whitner answered that she thought she would write a letter in all promptness reassuring the person inquiring that she was a citizen. Mrs. Whitner repeated again that she was uneasy.

Dr. Wahle asked Mrs. Whitner if at the time she asked the question she was aware that the members of the Board were required to swear to uphold the laws of the State of Washington and to defend the Constitution of the United States. Mrs. Whitner said that she had not known it as she could not find it in the law, and said that if it is true she would like to know it. She said she was told that the Board members do swear to uphold the laws when they take office by the Board member who visited with her.

Dr. Wahle asked Mrs. Whitner if as a faculty member she were required to take an oath that she would support the laws of the state and the Constitution of the United States. "Every faculty member signs a statement do they not?" asked Dr. Wahle. Mrs. Whitner replied, "yes."

Dr. Wilson asked Mrs. Whitner if she has had to make the choice between loyalty to the academic community or loyalty to the Constitution or if she was just worried about some future time. Mrs. Whitner said that following the writing of the WICHE letter she met with Dr. Brooks, Dr. Crum, Dr. Kollmeyer and Dr. Hertz and she realized then there was a great deal of furor. She said the question was asked of her why she did it. She said she replied that she had a sense of urgency. She said she had used the avenues open to a citizen concerned about freedom: the public library, the mail service, the press, contact with the elected representatives - and that she wrote to the legislature and used everything she could as a citizen because she frankly felt a sense of urgency that is still with her. Mrs. Whitner indicated that she had met again with Drs. Brooks, Crum, Kollmeyer and Hertz and had asked the question she subsequently asked the Board; and following the meeting she had asked if it would be permissible to write to the Board. Dr. Brooks indicated that it was.

Dr. Wilson asked Mrs. Whitner again if she had had to make the choice between loyalty to the academic community or loyalty to the Constitution any time in the past. He asked her if she felt there was some conflict when she acted as a citizen. Mrs. Whitner replied that she felt the time could easily come when this would be true. Dr. Wilson asked if it had happened in the past. Mrs. Whitner said that she was concerned about everything that has happened the past two years.

Dr. Wilson told Mrs. Whitner she had mentioned many things but never a specific instance where she had to make a choice. Mrs. Whitner replied that actually when she sent out the letters she had made a choice. She said to take action of that kind takes a great deal of courage and, in taking it, she acted as a citizen. Dr. Wilson asked her how that required her to make a choice between being a citizen and a member of the academic community. Mrs. Whitner replied that, according to the Board member who visited her, her questions were legitimate but that her method was wrong. She said she had never been able to separate end and method. When asked by Dr. Wilson if there was some specific method she replied that in the first letter from the Board it was outlined to her that she should go through channels and she read "It was the opinion of the Board that we should not depart from regular procedure, and that, therefore, this matter should first be discussed with the Faculty Council with the possibility that this group might want full participation of the faculty. If by this route your questions cannot be satisfactorily resolved, then it would be in order to present the problem to the Board for further consideration." Mrs. Whitner said this letter did not give her an answer, so she wrote to the Board again. She read from her letter as follows: "Your reply of November 26, raises several additional questions. I am unable to find in the Board minutes any record of official action taken on my communication. Yet the Board has referred me to the Faculty Council. Should I regard a letter which unofficially proposes a procedure, as a sufficiently proper basis for undertaking a course of action? Your letter also makes no mention of the date of the executive session at which my letter was discussed."

"According to your letter of November 26, "...it was the opinion of the Board that we should not depart from regular procedure." on my question. Does this mean that regular procedure on a question such as I have asked is outlined in the Faculty Code? Or is it outlined in the by-laws of the Board? Because this matter is of serious import to all concerned, I shall appreciate knowing officially and precisely the procedure the Board is advising me to follow. If the procedure is outlined in

the Faculty Code, then the exact page, paragraph, and date of issuance of the Code to be followed should be indicated. If the procedure is outlined in the by-laws of the Board, then I should know the exact wording."

Mrs. Whitner said the answer in reply to that letter came from Dr. Brooks and he said it would be taken up with the President's Council, as she recalled.

Dr. Wahle used a comparison then saying that anyone concerned about any specific law goes to the lower court and then proceeds on up to the Supreme Court. He said he did not in any way mean to compare the Board to the Supreme Court but the Board of Trustees is the final ruling body of the college and its actions are carried out by administrative groups on the campus. The Board was providing the usual procedures as it has done on all similar kinds of business and he could not see how Mrs. Whitner could object to the Board's setting up its own procedures. Dr. Wahle indicated that the usual procedure was that such a question would be reflected upon by the Faculty Council. He stated that apparently Mrs. Whitner had not presented it to that group. Mrs. Whitner replied that she had not - that if she had taken it to the Faculty Council, she would have in effect answered her own question, accepting as fact that the academic community - her colleagues - held the answer to this question.

Following further discussion on this point Mrs. Therriault asked Mrs. Whitner why she didn't go to the Superior Court Judge. Mrs. Whitner replied that it hadn't occurred to her, and then indicated that she still did not feel she had received an answer from the Board to her question.

Dr. Brooks indicated to Mrs. Whitner that he wished to disagree with her review of the series of events of the past two years. He indicated to Mrs. Whitner that her activities have been the subject of many inquiries to the president of the college and that he had a file on many of the events that were described. He stated that in the first place many faculty members were invited by the President of the college to comment on the symposium topic on November 13, 1961. Mrs. Whitner answered on November 21, questioning the apparent bias of the symposium proposal. Partially because of this, Mrs. Whitner was appointed by the president to the Symposium Committee. Dr. Brooks said Mrs. Whitner's was the only objection to the symposium from the faculty. Dr. Brooks indicated to Mrs. Whitner he could not agree that all symposium plans were made prior to meetings of the committee. Mrs. Whitner raised objections that no official meetings were held prior to the symposium whereas three faculty meetings were held to discuss the symposium in January, February, and March of 1962. Mrs. Whitner did not raise any objections at any of these meetings but resigned from the Symposium Committee.

Dr. Brooks said there are many other details that Mrs. Whitner didn't bring out in her background discussion including her letters on "academic freedom and professional autonomy" that were sent as far as Maine. Dr. Brooks said the administration during the last two years had tried to protect Mrs. Whitner's rights and had tried to explain to her the problems that she was creating.

Dr. Brooks indicated that at one meeting he asked her if she thought she might be bypassing her colleagues when she wrote to newspapers criticising the symposium;

he also asked if she realized that the implications were that college resources were being used by her in her letter writing. Dr. Brooks said Mrs. Whitner did not reply when he questioned her on these things. Dr. Brooks said that at the second meeting he had with Mrs. Whitner and with Drs. Crum, Kollmeyer and Hertz they talked about the question she later asked the Board regarding her loyalty to the academic community and loyalty to the Constitution of the United States. At that time, Dr. Brooks continued, Mrs. Whitner was told that the obvious answer was that she had to uphold the Constitution and that would be the answer the Board would give her if they were questioned. Dr. Brooks said they could not see involving the President's Council and felt Mrs. Whitner should have a hearing with the Board. Dr. Brooks said he had not wanted to censure Mrs. Whitner not only for her sake but for the sake of the entire academic community. He had wanted to protect Mrs. Whitner but the situation had gotten to the point where public relations of the college were being hurt. Dr. Brooks again indicated he did not want to hurt Mrs. Whitner and that the college wanted to protect her right to write letters and to question.

Mrs. Whitner replied that rather than to take up point by point the things that Dr. Brooks had said she would just like to say that in all instances she has thought through carefully what she did and in every instance she acted as a citizen. Mrs. Whitner said that in other words she has made the decision herself.

At one point Mrs. Whitner was asked whether she felt her actions had damaged public relations of the college and Mrs. Whitner replied negatively and added that she felt that careful public scrutiny of this situation would be helpful. She also added that she had not written about any other matters to those outside of the college since her meetings with Dr. Brooks.

Dr. Brooks commended Mrs. Whitner for not writing letters outside the college community on college matters (only to college personnel) since his last meeting with her. He said she was to be complimented for going to the faculty with statements of her concerns, after she had met with him on the two occasions mentioned above.

At this point Mrs. Whitner said that she had one other thing to bring to the attention of the Board if she had permission to do so. She said this just came up and revives her original question. She indicated that she had been a member of the General Education Committee for the past two years and she was asked if she wished to remain or wished to be removed. She indicated she was willing to remain, and then she received a letter dated June 4, 1963, reading "We, the undersigned, have concluded that, in the best interests of the college, we should at this time resign from the General Education Committee. We also strongly urge you to do the same. It is our understanding that you wish to remain on the committee. Nevertheless, it is our feeling that, having enjoyed the privilege of representing the faculty for two years, it is in the best interest of the general education program to allow wider expression of faculty thinking by supporting the appointment of an entirely new committee. It is our hope that you will agree with this decision." This letter was signed by five other members of the General Education Committee. Then Mrs. Whitner stated she received a copy of a letter dated June 5 to Dr. Brooks, written by the Chairman of the General Education Committee. This latter letter recommended that Mrs. Whitner not be retained on the General Education

Committee because she had voted generally against the proposals being made by the committee.

Dr. Brooks said he did not understand her concern, and asked her whose right it was to make committee appointments. Mrs. Whitner replied that Dr. Brooks had that right. Dr. Brooks asked Mrs. Whitner if he should have this right, and Mrs. Whitner replied that she thought he should have the right, but that she should decide whether she wanted to remain on the committee or not. Dr. Brooks stated that the five faculty members may have just as much right to recommend that Mrs. Whitner be removed and again said that he did not understand her concern. Mrs. Whitner asked if no dissenter was to be allowed. Dr. Brooks asked her (1) if she objected to a recommendation of this kind; (2) if the faculty members did not have a right to make a recommendation to him and (3) if he did not have the right to make committee appointments in the best interest of the college. Mrs. Whitner replied that she would not take that right from him nor deny the committee members the right to make such recommendations. Dr. Wahle asked Mrs. Whitner what her original question was then and Mrs. Whitner stated that she has steadily voted against the General Education program. Mrs. Whitner indicated she felt the recommendation implied that a person should be removed for taking a stand, that the academic community does not support a person who disagrees. Dr. Brooks asked her if the whole academic community is to be blamed for five faculty members acting within their rights. Mrs. Whitner said that the faculty members rights should not be denied but that she was interested in preserving the individual's right to disagree.

After further discussion Dr. Wilson asked Mrs. Whitner if she felt she was in the minority on the changes taking place at the college and on many topics discussed in faculty groups and on committees and she being a minority wished the Board to protect her rights. Since the college was a public institution then it seemed to Dr. Wilson that Mrs. Whitner felt it was her duty as a citizen to publicize the changes outside the academic community because the trend was opposite the way it should go, in her opinion, and she wrote letters far beyond the academic community so these changes would become a greater part of public discussion. He asked Mrs. Whitner if this were her point of view and she said that she did not feel that she was a minority of one but that she was only responsible for one, herself. Mrs. Whitner said that if she had her way everyone would know everything. Dr. Brooks reminded Mrs. Whitner faculty members are well informed and involved in college government. Her appointment to important faculty committees during the past two years was an example of this, Dr. Brooks said. He added that in discussions many ideas are going to come out and that the thoughts and rights of others should be considered and respected.

Dr. Wahle said that he has not been aware of a governing board that is more deeply concerned with the rights of citizens, whether assenting or dissenting, than Central's board. He stated this is a matter of record. Dr. Wahle went on to say that though the members of the board had been made aware of Mrs. Whitner's correspondence it had felt it in accordance with the board's principles to protect her academic freedom. The board was brought in when a letter was addressed to it by Mrs. Whitner asking what was, in her opinion, a basic question. Dr. Wahle reiterated that the members of the Board are sworn to uphold the law and therefore there is no other answer to give Mrs. Whitner but to say to her that if,

in her opinion, she seems to be confronted with a decision in any given instance, she would be told to support the laws of the State of Washington and the Constitution of the United States. Dr. Wahle pointed out that the board was providing a hearing in the way in which Mrs. Whitner wished to be heard and that he felt sincerely that the board has answered her question, and that the board has been sworn to uphold the laws and that in the board's opinion there is no choice. If there should be a conflict between the academic community and the laws or the Constitution the obedience must be given to the laws and the Constitution as these are interpreted by the courts.

Mrs. Whitner asked for a transcript of the hearing and was advised the minutes of the meeting would be available to her. Mrs. Whitner thanked the board.

Continuing on to the next item on the agenda, Dr. Brooks introduced Dr. Alexander Howard, Jr., Chairman of the Division of Education who presented a report from his division. Dr. Brooks explained this was the first of six programs (one from each division) being planned to acquaint the Board with the academic programs of the college.

Dr. Howard said the program would be presented in three parts: (1) General Objectives; (2) Problems and Possible Solutions and (3) A question and answer period. Dr. Howard read the General Objectives of the College and the objectives of the teacher education program and noted that these were listed in the General College Catalog. He then introduced Dr. Pettit who outlined six problem areas: 1. The need for expanding laboratory experiences (a) for training in the education area - students need earlier and more contacts with the children. (b) for training in the administrative area - 1 year of actual experience under a supervisor is required and (c) for training of special persons in psychology for public schools. There just are not enough schools in Ellensburg in which to train these people. The college is growing faster than the community. 2. The need to reduce heavy teaching loads and professional commitments. Dr. Pettit said more technical equipment and additional staff will be needed to provide a greater efficiency in instruction. 3. The need to expand the research center. Dr. Pettit pointed out some progress has been made in this area but personnel, additional space, reduced loads, etc., will be required in the immediate future. 4. The need for program development in (a) Philosophy, (b) Psychology, (c) Special education, (d) Library science, and (e) the College Elementary School. 5. The need for preparation of teachers - the demand is greater than the supply. At present there is a great demand for elementary school teachers although more students are taking their training on the secondary level. 6. The special needs of summer school (a) the program is more specialized (b) 90% of the enrollment is upper division students (requiring more staff) (c) the summer school budget in 1964 has been curtailed. In the question and answer period which followed, Miss Hebler discussed the College Elementary School and said she thought it could be more of an experiment and research area for the college. It was pointed out that making elementary education teaching more "prestigious" and providing students with earlier contacts with children in the elementary grades might encourage more students to train in the elementary field. In answer to a question from Dr. Wilson, Dr. Howard said his division was still waiting for a report from Dr. Conant as a result of Dr. Conant's visit to the campus.

In other reports Dr. Brooks indicated that administrators from the college had met with the Chamber of Commerce Board and with officers of the Ellensburg Development Corporation in connection with Mr. James Cowles' brief on Central Washington State College. Dr. Brooks reported the Chamber of Commerce will continue to study the brief and will work along with the college on ways to improve the working relationships between the city and the college.

Continuing with the Reports to the Board Dr. Brooks reminded the Board that their expense accounts must be submitted well in advance of July 1 because of the closing of the college fiscal year.

Dr. Brooks distributed copies of the Civil Service Report for May, 1963, and also copies of the Housing and Admissions report for fall, 1963. The admissions report showed 1525 applications as of June 3, 1963, compared to 1574 applications for July 30, 1962. A Budget Report for the period and month ending April 30, 1963 was also distributed for the information of the Board. As his final report Dr. Brooks indicated that House Bill 257 - Chapter 89 provides for the refunding of fees, but that the administration generally does not plan to refund the \$35 admissions processing fee unless there should be some specific circumstances indicating a refund should be made. This procedure will be proposed to the other two state colleges so that a uniform policy may be established to discourage multi-applications.

MOTION NO. 428: Dr. Wahle moved, seconded by Mrs. Therriault, that the reports be accepted. Motion carried.

COMMUNICATIONS

Dr. Brooks said a form allowing the use of the Student Union Building as a defense shelter from Mr. Al Johnson, local Civil Defense Director and a request to have new dormitories include space for shelter purposes from the state Civil Defense Director had been received. Mr. Bouillon signed the form designating the CUB as a defense shelter.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Dr. Brooks gave a brief summary of the preparatory work that had gone into compiling the Budget for 1963-65 including work with the Joint Boards of Trustees for the basis of the budget. Dr. Brooks explained that across the board cuts had to be made in order to keep expenditures within the anticipated revenues.

MOTION NO. 429: Mrs. Therriault moved, seconded by Dr. Wilson, the approval of the General Budget for 1963-65 in the amount of \$6,835,595. Motion carried.

It had been anticipated that a representative from the firm of Fred Bassetti, architects for the new dormitory, would be present to continue discussion on the use of an interior designer for the new buildings; however, Mr. Bassetti was unable to be present himself and no representative was in the audience so the matter was delayed until the July meeting of the Board.

NEW BUSINESS

MOTION NO. 430: Dr. Wahle moved, seconded by Dr. Wilson, that the request of Dr. John Shrader for a leave of absence from 9/1/63 to 9/1/64 to teach at the University of Florida be approved. Motion carried.

A list of promotions and one-year salary adjustments for 1963-64 were presented by Dr. Brooks to the Board. The President pointed out the salary adjustments were for a one year period only. The adjustments were being made for outstanding performance and service to the institution. Dr. Brooks also indicated a study would be made of the use of funds to award meritorious service.

MOTION NO. 431: Dr. Wahle moved, seconded by Mrs. Therriault, that the promotions and one-year salary adjustments for 1963-64 be approved as follows: Promotions - Gerald Moulton to Associate Professor; Ramona Solberg to Associate Professor; Keith Rinehart to Professor; James Nylander to Associate Professor; Robert Brown to Associate Professor and Margaret Linn to Assistant Professor. One-year salary adjustments - Donald Murphy, \$300; Alexander Howard, Jr., \$200; Eldon Jacobsen, \$100; Barbara Kohler, \$100; Jack Crawford, \$100; Irene McPherson, \$100; William Floyd, \$100; Louis Kollmeyer, \$300; Wayne Hertz, \$200; Bert Christianson, \$100; Reino Randall, \$100; George Sogge, \$100; Odette Golden, \$300; Hazel Dunnington, \$200; Donald Cummings, \$100; Lyman Partridge, \$100; Eric Beardsley, \$300; Abe Poffenroth, \$100; Wilma Moore, \$100; Mina Zenor, \$100; Adrian Beamer, \$100; Bruce Alan Robinson, \$300; Donald Baepler, \$200; Dan Willson, \$100; Robert Gaines, \$100; Martin Kaatz, \$300; Floyd Rodine, \$300; Robert Yee, \$100 and Gerald Olson, \$100. Motion carried.

Mr. Robinson, acting chairman of the Division of Science, discussed the AEC grant of \$10,000 for science equipment. Dr. Wilson advised that funds are available for study at the Hanford Atomic Energy laboratories. Dr. Crum indicated Arthur Ladd will be attending the meeting in connection with this and will obtain the necessary information so the college may consider participation.

MOTION NO. 432: Dr. Wilson moved, seconded by Mrs. Therriault that the AEC grant of \$10,000 for science equipment be approved. Motion carried.

MOTION NO. 433: Dr. Wahle moved, seconded by Dr. Wilson that the part time leave of absence for Sarah Spurgeon for the 1963-64 academic year (autumn, 50%; winter, 100%, and spring, 50%) be approved. Motion carried.

MOTION NO. 434: Mrs. Therriault moved, seconded by Dr. Wahle, that the Business Manager be authorized to negotiate with a bank for interim financing, at the best possible interest rate, for construction of the new dormitories, in the amount guaranteed by the HHFA, and to provide payments for the architect. Motion carried.

MOTION NO. 435: Dr. Wahle moved, seconded by Mrs. Therriault, the approval of the employment of Mr. Robert Howser for the position of Personnel Director at a salary of \$7,500 annually. Motion carried.

The Student Government Association Budget was taken under consideration next by the Board. Dr. Brooks indicated the S. G. A. budget for 1963-65 which just reached him late this afternoon was a great improvement over past years and that Mr. Quann and the officers of the Student Government Association had worked on it in a business-like manner. Mr. Quann's accompanying letter said that the overall budget was financially sound and worthy of acceptance but that the Crier budget is incomplete and will need further study and approval next fall. He recommended that the 1963-64 budget be approved and a review scheduled for the 1964-65 budget prior to final acceptance. Dr. Samuelson gave his approval of the S. G. A. Budget for 1963-64 with the reservation that the budget for 1964-65 may need to be reviewed next year. Dr. Brooks indicated he would need more time to study the budget before he could make recommendations. He suggested that the item could be discussed in detail at the July 26 board meeting.

MOTION NO. 436: Dr. Wilson moved, seconded by Mrs. Therriault, that the 1963-64 S. G. A. budget be tentatively approved and be considered in detail at the subsequent meeting of the Board. Motion carried.

MOTION NO. 437: Mrs. Therriault moved, seconded by Dr. Wilson, that the next meeting of the Board of Trustees be on the evening of July 26 in Bellingham, Washington. Motion carried.

The meeting was recessed at 11:30 p. m. for an executive session and reconvened at 12:00 p. m.

MOTION NO. 438: Mrs. Therriault moved, seconded by Dr. Wilson, that the firm of Doudna, Williams, and Phipps be employed as the architect for the new administration building. Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION NO. 440: Mrs. Therriault moved that the minutes for the meeting of June 1, 1964, be approved. Motion was seconded by Dr. Wilson. Motion carried.

Under New Business was taken up next as a continuation of Mr. Bassett. Mr. Bassett stated the preliminary plans for the construction of new dormitories has been approved by the committees involved in the planning and have also been reviewed by the campus planner. Mr. Bassett presented drawings showing building floor plans, elevations, individual room floor plans, and perspectives. He also presented a scale model of the proposed buildings, adjacent dormitories and planned landscaping.

MOTION NO. 441: Dr. Wells moved, seconded by Mrs. Davis, that the Board of Trustees approve the Preliminary drawings of the proposed new dormitories as proposed by Mr. Bassett and authorize the architect to proceed with working drawings. Motion carried.

MOTION NO. 442: Mrs. Davis moved, seconded by Mrs. Therriault, that an Interior Designer be employed by the college to assist Mr. Bassett with the new dormitories.